

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner noted that claims 1-14 are pending in the application and that claims 1-14 stand rejected. By this response, claims 1 and 8 are amended to more clearly point out the invention of the Applicant and in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions. All other claims are unamended by this response.

In view of the amendments presented above and the following discussion, the Applicant respectfully submits that none of these claims now pending in the application are anticipated under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 102 or rendered obvious under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 103. Thus the Applicant believes that all of these claims are now in allowable form.

Rejections**A. 35 U.S.C. § 102**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5-10 and 12-14 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Duruoz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,654,539, hereinafter "Duruoz").

In the Final Office Action the Examiner noted that the Applicant's claims are claimed too broadly to overcome Duruoz. However, the Examiner submitted that "since Duruoz has history as best can be said corresponding to one GOP, it seems clear that applicant can claim that the history is more than one GOP history data, as understood, while Duruoz has a less history data than the invention in the invention". As such, the Applicant has herein amended claim 1 as suggested by the Examiner to distinguish the Applicant's invention over Duruoz. More specifically, the Applicant's amended claim 1 specifically recites:

A method for reproducing a digital data stream containing program information for trick mode display, said method including the steps:

- a) decoding the incoming digital data stream in normal playmode,
- b) creating a group of picture structure history having more than one group of pictures during said decoding step,
- c) storing said history,

- d) editing for playback in trick mode said digital data stream using said history,
- e) decoding said digital data stream edited for trick mode display. (emphasis added).

As conceded by the Examiner and agreed on by the Applicant, the teachings of Duruoaz has a history that at best can be said corresponds to one GOP. In contrast, the Applicant teaches and claims that the history is more than one GOP history data.

In support of at least claim 1, the Applicant in the Specification specifically recites:

"MPEG bitstreams are encoded in GOP structures containing I, P and /or B frame types. The number of frames may vary depending on for example the picture content or compression standard. To reconstruct the video picture sequence in display order it is necessary to reorder the different frame types according to the GOP structure. The information of the GOP structure is not explicitly defined but is discovered and used during the normal decoding process. However, for free navigation in the picture display order to decode any picture out of the GOP, it is necessary to know the GOP structure in advance i.e., explicitly.

An MPEG bitstream is built upon a GOP structure containing one independently encoded I-frame and several P and B frames dependently encoded from this I frame. This is done to have best results in data compression. The GOP structure is chosen free by the encoder and may even vary within every new GOP in the bitstream." (See Specification, page 1, line 29 through page 2, line 10). (emphasis added).

As clearly taught in at least the portion of the Applicant's disclosure presented above, in the invention of the Applicant, an MPEG bitstream is built upon a GOP structure, the MPEG bitstream being composed of a plurality of GOPs. In the invention of the Applicant, a GOP history is generated for the GOPs of the bistream by an existing decoder, the history listing the type of pictures in the GOPs and their order. The GOP history is then later used to control the trick mode editing. More specifically the Applicant specifically recites:

"Editing allows the original bitstream to be changed in such a way that for the trick mode decoding the required parts are extracted and prepared for the standard decoding hardware. Advantageously the GOP structure is created during normal playback mode hence pre-parsing

software or special pre-parsing hardware is avoided." (See Specification, page 2, line 28 through page 3, line 1).

As clearly evident from at least the portions of the Applicant's disclosure presented above, in various embodiments of the Applicant's invention, a history of the GOP structures of a received bistream is created during normal playback and is stored in a memory. Subsequently, during a trick mode, the GOP history is used to help position a pick-up to select a proper position in a data stream for selection of a required picture of the various GOPs which is extracted and prepared for the standard decoding hardware. In contrast to the invention of the Applicant and as conceded by the Examiner, the teachings of Duruoaz has a history that at best can be said corresponds to one GOP.

Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that the teachings and disclosure of Duruoaz do not anticipate the Applicant's invention, at least with respect to amended independent claim 1.

Therefore, the Applicant submits that for at least the reasons recited above, independent claim 1 is not anticipated by the teachings of Duruoaz and, as such, fully satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 102 and is patentable thereunder.

Likewise, independent claim 8 recites similar relevant features as recited in the Applicant's independent claim 1. As described above, there is absolutely no teaching, suggestion or disclosure in Duruoaz for at least "an editor coupled to said memory for editing said digital data stream using said history for playback in trick mode" as claimed by the Applicant's independent claims 1 and 8. As such, the Applicant respectfully submits that for at least the reasons recited above independent claim 8 is also not anticipated by the teachings of Duruoaz and also fully satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 102 and is patentable thereunder.

Furthermore, dependent claims 2-3, 5-7, 9-10 and 12-14 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claims 1 and 8 and recite additional features therefor. As such and for at least the reasons set forth herein, the Applicant submits that dependent claims 2-3, 5-7, 9-10 and 12-14 are also not anticipated by the teachings of Duruoaz. Therefore the Applicant submits that dependent claims 2-3, 5-7, 9-10 and 12-14 also fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 102 and are patentable thereunder.

The Applicant reserves the right to establish the patentability of each of the claims individually in subsequent prosecution.

C. 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 4 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duruo et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,654,539, hereinafter "Duruo"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding claims 4 and 11, the Examiner submits that Duruo fails to particularly disclose decoding a B frame without storing its content. However, the Examiner takes official notice that frames after a decoder can be sent to a rendering device such as a digital display without any storing with respect to the output of the MPEG decoder.

However, as recited above and for at least the reasons recited above, the Applicant respectfully submits that Duruo absolutely fails to teach, suggest or make obvious the invention of the Applicant at least with respect to the Applicant's claims 1 and 8. As such and for at least the reasons described above, the Applicant respectfully submits that since the teachings of Duruo fail to teach, suggest or make obvious the invention of the Applicant with regard to at least the Applicant's amended claims 1 and 8, the teachings of Duruo also fail to teach, suggest or make obvious the Applicant's claims 4 and 11 which depend directly and indirectly, respectively, from the Applicant's claims 1 and 8.

Therefore, the Applicant submits that claims 4 and 11, as they now stand, fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 103 and are patentable thereunder.

The Applicant reserves the right to establish the patentability of each of the claims individually in subsequent prosecution.

Conclusion

Thus the Applicant submits that none of the claims, presently in the application, are anticipated under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 102 or obvious under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 103. Consequently, the Applicant believes that all these claims are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

CUSTOMER NO.: 24498

Serial No. 09/640,104

RCE - Reply to Final Office Action dated: 1/25/07

Response dated: 05/07/07

PATENT

PD990048

If however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring adverse final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned.

If any fee is due and not paid for, the Commissioner is authorized to please charge the additional fee to Deposit Account No. 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,

Dirk Adolph

By:



Jorge Tony Villabon, Attorney

Reg. No. 52,322

(609) 734-6445

Patent Operations

Thomson Licensing Inc.

P.O. Box 5312

Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312

May 07, 2007